Application Number 09/900,101
Amendment dated August 6, 2004
Responsive to Office Action mailed May 7, 2004

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated May 7, 2004. Applicant has amended claims 1, 12-14, 16-20, 26, 29, 31, 37, 40, 41, 43, 44, 47 and 50 for purposes of clarification. Claims 1-53 are pending upon entry of this amendment.

Information Disclosure Statement

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the information disclosure statements filed May 7, 2002 and October 15, 2002 fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because a concise explanation was not provided for all non-English references. However, neither of these information disclosure statements submitted non-English references. To the contrary, both information disclosure statements cited U.S. patents. Consequently, no concise explanations are required under 37 CFR 1.98 (a)(3). Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide initialed PTO-1449 forms for the subject information disclosure statements. For the convenience of the Examiner, Applicant has attached the previously submitted PTO-1449 forms with this communication.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-53 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cheng (US 6,067,548). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Cheng fails to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention, as required by 35 U.S.C. 102(b), and provides no teaching that would have suggested the desirability of modification to include such features.

For example, Cheng fails to teach or suggest a software utility for interacting with a user to classify a software resource according to a predetermined domain model, as recited by Applicant's amended claim 1. Moreover, Cheng fails to teach or suggest such a software utility comprising data type mapping means that allow the user to map data types to the domain model, and function mapping means that allow the user to map software resource functions to the domain model, as recited by Applicant's amended claim 1.

In contrast, Cheng describes a system for modeling an enterprise, e.g., a corporation. Specifically, the Cheng system allows a user to define and manipulate objects to represent

-10-

organizational resources to model the resources within an enterprise. As such, Cheng is focused on the problem of dynamically representing organizational resources in the context of an organizational hierarchy. In fact, Cheng provides the specific example of an organizational hierarchy that is developed which includes "employees 70 belonging to a particular department 72 such as engineering, or name engineers 78."[1]

Consequently, Cheng is irrelevant to Applicant's claimed invention, which generally relates to techniques that allow enterprises to catalog and retrieve software assets deployed by an enterprise by capturing and mapping the deployed enterprises to domain reference models (DRMs). Cheng is unrelated to the classification of software assets, and entirely fails to even mention domain models, as recited by Applicant's claims. Applicant has made certain amendments by way of this communication to clarify that, in some embodiments, the claims are directed to classification of software resources and the mapping of the software resources to domain models.

In view of the present Office Action, it appears that the Examiner may have confused the use of the term "domain" in Cheng with a "domain model," as recited by the Applicant. Cheng states that "[a] domain corresponds to a *physical* implementation ... Multiple organizations can reside in a domain, but an organization does not span across domains." (emphasis added).[2]

In contrast, a "domain model," as described in the present application and well-known in the software industry, provides a high-level representation of a process, such as a business, technical or application process. The present application describes techniques for classifying enterprise software resources, and mapping the enterprise software resources to domain models.[3] For purposes of illustration, Applicant refers the Examiner to FIG. 1 of the present application, which illustrates an exemplary insurance domain model, FIG. 2 which illustrates an expansion of a category of the exemplary domain model, FIG. 3 which illustrates an example use case for the exemplary domain model, and FIG. 4 which illustrates software functions associated with the example use case of the domain model. As clearly illustrated by at least these figures and related

---

[1] Col. 7, ll. 26-30.
[2] Col. 11, ll. 62-67.
[3] See, e.g., page 9 of the present application, and FIGS. 9-12 and the related description.

-11-

description, a "domain model" describes and relates high-level business processes to software components.

In view of at least the foregoing, with respect to Applicant's claim 1, Cheng fails to teach or describe a system that includes a data type mapping means that allows a user to map data types to a domain model. Cheng makes no mention of domain models at all, let alone a means for mapping software data types to a domain model, as required by claim 1. Again, Cheng is focused on the problem of dynamically representing organizational resources (e.g., employees) in the context of an organizational hierarchy. Similarly, Cheng fails to describe a function mapping means that allows the user to map resource functions to the domain model.

In view of these deficiencies, contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Cheng fails to describe or suggest virtually all of the limitations of claims 2-53.

For example, Cheng fails to teach or suggest the data type mapping means and function mapping means wherein the domain model comprises a process model comprising processes and use cases and a structural model comprising reference components, reference interfaces and reference function, as required by claim 2. Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, column 11 of Cheng does not describe any of these features. Instead, column 11 of Cheng describes a "run-time architecture" for the enterprise modeling system and mechanisms for extracting employee data from enterprise databases, such as an HR database.

As another example, Cheng fails to describe a software utility for managing software resources within an enterprise, comprising a database comprising software resource information including location information and functionality information, the functionality information being mapped to a domain model, as recited by amended claim 12. Again, Cheng makes no mention of domain models, and is unrelated to, mapping software resource information to a domain model, as recited by claim 12.

Similarly, with respect to amended 31, Cheng fails to teach or suggest a method of classifying a software resource comprising functions and data types, the method comprising providing a domain model comprising model functions and mode data types; mapping resource data types to model data types to produce data type maps, mapping resource functions to model functions to produce function maps, and storing the data type maps and function maps in a searchable database.

-12-

With respect to amended claim 40, Cheng fails to teach or suggest a method of managing software resources within an enterprise, comprising: maintaining a searchable database of software resource information including location information and functionality information, the functionality information being mapped to a domain model.

With respect to claim 51, Cheng fails to teach or suggest a method of mapping a software resource to a domain model as recited by the Applicant.

Cheng fails to disclose each and every limitation set forth in claims 1-53. For at least these reasons, the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case for anticipation of Applicant's claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION

All claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 50-1778. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application.

Date: By:

August 6, 2004   _Kent J. Sieffert_
SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A.   Name: Kent J. Sieffert
8425 Seasons Parkway, Suite 105   Reg. No.: 41,312
St. Paul, Minnesota 55125
Telephone: 651.735.1100
Facsimile: 651.735.1102

-13-